



2015

Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score

Technical Manual

A Guide To Component and Overall Score Calculation

table of contents

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW. 3 - 4

COMPONENT SCORE CALCULATION 5 - 11

Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Passing Percentages 5 - 7

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Surveys 7 - 9

Effectiveness Labels Scoring Methodology 9 - 12

OVERALL SCORE CALCULATION 13 - 15

CONCLUSION 15

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Referent Group Report
- Appendix B: 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Surveys
- Appendix C: Progressive Corrective Action System Diagram

background & overview

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW ON THE EDUCATOR PREPARATION INSTITUTION (EPI) PERFORMANCE SCORE

Title II, Section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) requires that each state establish criteria and identify and assist teacher preparation institutions that are not performing at a satisfactory level. States must also report annually to the United States Department of Education (USED) a statement of their procedures, along with a list of low-performing and at-risk teacher preparation institutions.

On October 9, 2007, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved, with amendments, a set of procedures that reflect the overall effectiveness of preparation programs using multiple factors. Criteria within the procedures include the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) test scores, new teacher efficacy surveys, supervisor validation of new teachers' efficacy, program completion rates, and an additional consideration regarding the program's mission to be responsive to the state's teacher preparation needs.¹

In the spring of 2012, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) created a cross-departmental committee to focus on educator effectiveness in order to improve the systems impacting educator preparation and to ensure the state's programs continue to advance in quality. A sub-committee was formed to focus specifically on the development of a revised Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score. The sub-committee utilized the MDE and the SBE's priorities to focus the work. The team examined the entire score, as well as the metrics used for assessing the EPIs.

The sub-committee developed three primary goals to provide greater focus for EPIs and align the score more closely to MDE priorities. In the "Overall Score Calculation" section of this document, these goals are listed, which include seven measureable sub-elements or factors that are tightly aligned to the newly approved Michigan Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support

Consortium (MI-InTASC) standards.² The three goals, with their components, are as follows:

Goal #1: Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.

A. Exposure to and Demonstration of Content Knowledge and Content-Specific Pedagogy

1. Subject-Area Content
2. High-Quality Learning Experiences
3. Critical Thinking
4. Connection to Real World Problems and Local and Global Issues

B. Exposure to and Demonstration of General Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills

1. Technology
2. Special Populations
3. Learning Environments
4. Effective Use of Data

Goal #2: Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrate continuous improvement related to Michigan Department Education (MDE)-specific priorities.

1. Candidate Diversity (recruit, support, and retain underrepresented students)
2. Commitment to Clinical Preparation
3. State Evaluation System (flexible options in evaluation design)
4. Placement Rates in "shortage" areas (including support and advising of candidates in relation to "shortage" areas)

Goal #3: Ensure that program graduates meet standards for teacher effectiveness.

1. Demonstrate General Effectiveness
2. Placement Rates

¹ Source: MDE Annual Educator Performance Institution Score Report, July 22, 2013.

² Source: Memorandum from Superintendent Flanagan, Presentation of the Revised 2014 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score, July 22, 2013.

background & overview

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW ON THE EDUCATOR PREPARATION INSTITUTION (EPI) PERFORMANCE SCORE (continued)

When these goals and their components were clarified, the instrumentation used to gather data along the various goal components was also clarified. The table that appears in the “Overall Score Calculation” section of this document has been updated to show, in more detail, which goal component matches which instrumentation sources. The three instruments used for the 2015 EPI Performance Score are the following:

1. Percentages of teacher candidates who pass the content-based tests under The Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) system over the last three years;
2. Satisfaction and perception data from surveys administered to teacher candidates and candidate supervisors, twice annually; and
3. Point scores attributed to the latest three years’ worth of teacher effectiveness ratings within the last five calendar years for graduates from each EPI employed in Michigan public schools.

In each of these instruments, an “index score” was earned on a scale out of 100 possible points. The 100-point scale was used to simplify understanding the component scores, and to aid in a conversion to a weighted calculation across goal components. The “Overall Score Calculation” section of this document explains this in more detail.

Each year, the MDE reports the institutions identified as At Risk or Low Performing to the USED per the HEA requirements. In 2014, the MDE implemented a six-phase progressive corrective action system (see Appendix C of this document). In general, institutions starting at a status of Satisfactory which then are identified as not having met the established “cut score” for performance have two years to improve their performance before state sanctions occur. Institutions meeting the cut score move toward a Satisfactory label by a minimum of one phase per year that they meet the cut score. As a result, institutions progress into corrective action, or out of corrective action, based on their performance against the cut score, each year. The Referent Panel event (see the “January 2015 Referent Panel” section in this document as well as Appendix A for more information) establishes this cut score.

As a note, in future years, the MDE anticipates the possible contribution of other sources of data, such as surveys for cooperating teachers (or “mentor teachers”) of teacher candidates and measures for EPI response to teacher shortage areas and the needs for increased diversity among teaching candidates. These additional data sources would be intended to enhance the calculation of annual EPI performance score, after they have been validated and piloted before inclusion in an operational score.

component score calculation

MICHIGAN TEST FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION (MTTC) PASSING PERCENTAGES

State law in Michigan mandates a testing program as part of Michigan's teacher certification requirements. In June 1991, the MDE awarded National Evaluation Systems (now known as the Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson, or ES) a contract to develop and administer the testing program. The purpose of the tests is to ensure that each certified teacher has the level of content knowledge needed to perform effectively the job of a qualified Michigan educator. The tests are not the only basis on which prospective teachers are evaluated in Michigan, nor are the knowledge and skills covered by the tests the only types of knowledge and skills, or the only professional and personal qualifications, those teachers must have. The tests represent one prerequisite for obtaining a teaching certificate in Michigan.

The MTTC program includes both a Professional Readiness Examination (PRE) and content/subject-area assessments. The PRE has three subtests: reading, mathematics, and writing. By Michigan law, candidates must pass the PRE before a teacher candidate may be enrolled in student teaching. Some of Michigan's educator preparation institutions (EPIs) require passing of the PRE prior to admitting candidates to the EPI's teacher preparation program. Once a teacher candidate has completed an EPI's program (or nears completion) the candidate takes the MTTC content/subject area test that corresponds to their area(s) of preparation (major, minor, and/or endorsement program). By Michigan law, content/subject-area tests must be passed before the candidate's certificate is endorsed with the corresponding subject and grade level. Because the PRE is a gateway measure into student teaching and/or program admission, the results of the PRE are not appropriate to include in the EPI performance score. Only those scores obtained at or near the end of a candidate's experience are included.

MTTC content/subject-area passing percentages contribute to the overall EPI Performance Scores because the efficacy of an overall institutional content/subject-area preparatory programs can be evidenced, in part, by how teacher candidates perform on their

content/subject-area assessments at the conclusion (or near-conclusion) of their programs. As the MTTC content/subject-area assessments are aligned to specific Michigan State Board of Education-approved teaching standards related to content and subject area, they provide a measure of how well the teacher was prepared by the EPI overall, not just in the education department or college before taking the test.

For that reason, the EPI Performance Score uses a three-year aggregate, or combined passing percentage, of all MTTC content/subject-area tests administered to eligible candidates from each EPI. Eligible candidates are those candidates verified by EPIs as candidates from the EPI and are candidates who have completed at least 90% of required coursework in the content/subject-area of teacher authorization. Yearly MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the "cumulative" or "best attempt" of all eligible test-takers for content/subject-areas, which are administered during a twelve month period; candidates can retake a content/subject-area MTTC an unlimited number of times if they have an initial failing result. To calculate the aggregate passing percentage, the number of "best attempt" passing results during a three-year period is divided by the total number of registrations over the same period, by test. Multiple attempts made by a teacher candidate on a given MTTC test during the three-year period are counted as one registration. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used.

All MTTC tests are administered four times in paper-based format during a twelve month period (October, January, April, and July). In the other 8 months computer-based format is available for tests with high-frequency of use, e.g., professional readiness examination, elementary examination, English, history, mathematics (elementary), mathematics (secondary), social studies (elementary), social studies (secondary), etc.

component score calculation

MICHIGAN TEST FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION (MTTC) (continued)

For content/subject area tests that had fewer than 10 test-takers at a given EPI, the MDE aggregated all such programs into their own category, “Small Programs.” This category was treated as its own content/subject area test for the purposes of performing the three-year aggregate passing percentage calculations. Thus, for example, three programs at the same EPI with six, eight, and nine candidates over the three-year period, respectively, would be combined to calculate an aggregate passing percentage for “Small Programs” based on 23 MTTC content/subject area tests taken.

In October 2013, the following changes to two MTTC fields occurred:

1. Social Studies (test field 84) was split into two tests, Social Studies for Secondary Education, which kept the code of 84, and Social Studies for Elementary Education, which was given a test code of 105.
2. The 100-item Elementary Education (test field 83) was replaced with a 150-item Elementary Education test, with a new field code of 103.

The graphic below summarizes these changes visually.



In order to account for accurate “best attempt” passing rates for the MTTC component score on the EPI Performance Score and for the annual reports made available to Michigan’s EPIs and its State Board of Education, ES observed the following calculation rules:

component score calculation

MICHIGAN TEST FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION (MTTC) (continued)

1. If a test-taker registered for 84 after October 2013 also registered for 84 before that time, he or she was considered one “registrant” for the purposes of calculating a “best attempt” score. In other words, multiple registrations did not count against the EPI claiming that student.
2. If a test-taker registered for 105 after October 2013 also registered for 84 before that time, he or she was considered an 84 “registrant” for the purposes of calculating a “best attempt” score. In other words, multiple registrations did not count against the EPI claiming that student, just as they would not have for a test-taker attempting 84 again.
3. If a test-taker was registered for 84 or 105 but did not have a previous attempt at 84, their registration was considered “first-time” starting October 2013.
4. 83 and 103 were considered distinct tests; a test-taker attempting 103 after taking and not passing 83 prior to October 2013 was considered a separate “registrant” for the purposes of computing “best attempt” numbers.

Finally, programs that had been closed at an EPI during the three-year period from August 2011 to July 2014 were not included into the component score calculations for that EPI, for those years of closure. These programs are those that may have been closed resulting from a corrective action status within the last three years.

TEACHER CANDIDATE AND CANDIDATE SUPERVISOR SURVEYS

As another component of the EPI Performance Score, perception data are gathered in two windows during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) and candidate supervisors (CSs). Response data from these two sets of surveys aids in the measurement of the efficacy of teacher preparation programs, with questions aligned to policy goals and the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers (PSMTs) and the Michigan Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (MI-InTASC) standards.

Two survey windows are programmed per academic year to allow for flexibility in gathering data from teachers graduating from programs in different semesters. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span, in a window running from late 2013 to the end of January of 2014; and the Spring/Summer time span, in a window running from April of 2014 to the end of July 2014.

The audience for the TC surveys is teacher candidates who are finishing up their directed student teaching

for their preparation program and are within the last two weeks of that period. The CS surveys are for EPI faculty who directly supervise the placement and directed student teaching of teacher candidates and have regular contact with them throughout that period. The two survey sets include similar questions for each audience, with wording changes to reflect the nature of each audience: teacher candidates report direct perceptions of their actual preparation, while candidate supervisors report indirect evidence of preparation through observations of candidate behaviors.

While questions on the 2012-2013 surveys were aligned with the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers (PSMTs), the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has since adopted new policy goals, and the Michigan Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (MI-InTASC) standards were also adopted. By the time the 2013-2014 surveys had been administered, they were already revised to be based fully on MI-InTASC, and will be for subsequent EPI score calculations as well. Thus, the information available for the 2015 EPI Performance Score calculations is

component score calculation

TEACHER CANDIDATE AND CANDIDATE SUPERVISOR SURVEYS (continued)

the same as was available for the 2014 EPI Score calculations:

- Demographic information, including identification number
 - Age and race information
 - Major areas of specialization
 - Perception questions with 4-point Likert scales across six categories:
- 1) Have teacher candidates been prepared to design high-quality learning experiences?
 - 2) Have teacher candidates been prepared in applying critical thinking in their content area(s)?
 - 3) Have teacher candidates been prepared to deliver instruction relevant to real-world problems, and local and global issues?
 - 4) Have teacher candidates been prepared in the use of educational technology to maximize student learning?
 - 5) Have teacher candidates been prepared to address the needs of special populations?
 - 6) Have teacher candidates been prepared to organize learning environments?
 - 7) Have teacher candidates been prepared on the effective use of assessments and student data?

In addition to these categories, teacher candidates were also asked to provide perception data on their field experiences and clinical practice, something that candidate supervisors were not asked about, as it only pertained to the candidate's experience.

For the Spring/Summer 2014 CS Survey, a "Did Not Observe" field was introduced. This was done to allow for the possibility that some supervisors of teacher candidates did not observe certain MI-InTASC standards in their teacher candidates during the time of observation or work with that teacher candidate, but they observed others.

For the purposes of contribution to the EPI Performance Score, the "Did Not Observe" responses will NOT be included in the denominator for the purposes of calculating efficacy averages. In other words, a supervisor who reported as not having observed one or more areas will NOT have an adverse effect on the overall efficacy ratings.

Each category area described above has a different number of items that contribute to a total for that category area. Numerical responses to these items are aggregated, or combined, to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. For any one category, "efficacy" is defined as the overall percentage of "3" and "4" responses on the Likert scale; in other words, the number of "3" and "4" responses divided by the total number of responses possible for that category.

To calculate a final survey efficacy score (abbreviated SURV on the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report, the following calculation steps were observed:

- 1) For each response window (Fall/Winter 2013 and Spring/Summer 2014), each of the seven CS categories and each of the eight TC categories (the original seven plus the field experiences and clinical practice categories) had their overall efficacy ratings calculated using the definition of "efficacy" given above.
- 2) In many cases, institutions had very different numbers of graduates and therefore different volumes of responses between response windows. In order to more fairly compute an overall efficacy for both survey windows' worth of responses, a proportion was factored into the overall survey efficacy for each category based on the volume of responses. For example, an institution that had 15 responses in Fall/Winter for one respondent type and 45 in Spring/

component score calculation

TEACHER CANDIDATE AND CANDIDATE SUPERVISOR SURVEYS (continued)

- Summer for the same respondent type would have had a proportion “weighting” factor of 25% for its Fall/Winter efficacy and 75 for its Spring/Summer efficacy.
- 3) This factor was then applied to obtain a weighted average for each individual category, across both survey windows.
 - 4) The seven categories for CS surveys were then averaged to obtain one overall “2013-2014 CS Surveys” efficacy rating.
 - 5) The eight categories for TC surveys were then averaged to obtain one overall “2013-2014 TC Surveys” efficacy rating.
 - 6) An Overall SURV Efficacy rating for the 2015 EPI Performance Score was thus generated as an average from the 2013-2014 overall rates on the TC and CS surveys.

The text of the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Surveys themselves are included with this document as Appendix B.

EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS LABELS POINT ATTRIBUTION

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP), a statewide database that collects fields of data about teachers and other staff who are employed in Michigan’s public K–12 schools. The data collected include information about teacher assignment, certification validity and expiration, work site, and full-time status, among other details. Michigan’s legislation mandates the annual evaluation of teachers and the assignment of teacher effectiveness labels, indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” and “Ineffective” according to several factors, including student academic growth on statewide assessments.

The teacher effectiveness ratings became one source of data that contribute to the annual EPI Performance Score because the preparation that teachers receive at their college or university program directly impacts their effectiveness to deliver content within a strong pedagogical framework. It is also included as EPIs need to prepare their candidates for successful annual evaluations, and a measure of those candidates success in early annual evaluations can be reasonably considered to be a reflection of the preparation afforded by the EPI program. As research confirms, student growth in their academic performance is tied to

teacher effectiveness.³ Accordingly, it was decided that the teacher effectiveness labels would be collected and a point attribution methodology would be applied to the ratings of teachers who received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs, and that those point attributions would form one of the component scores for their annual performance score.

To compute this component score on teacher effectiveness for the annual EPI Performance Score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings on teachers in their first three years of experience. These data came from the most recent version of the June 2014 Michigan Online Educator Certification System (MOECS) database, merged with appearances in the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) database over a five-year period. MOECS uses certification data from each EPI, as well as roster data sent to MDE from personnel data administrators at school districts. The REP contains data on full-time equivalency (FTE) and effectiveness ratings. Teachers are assigned years of experience based on their career FTE. With these two data sources, reliable patterns of teacher effectiveness could be attributed to the EPI that originally recommended certification. Information on this process can be found in Table 1.

³ Kemp, L., & Hall, A. H. (1992). *Impact of effective teaching research on student achievement and teacher performance: Equity and access implications for quality education*. Jackson, MS: Jackson State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 360)

component score calculation

EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS LABELS POINT ATTRIBUTION (continued)

Each EPI was assigned a grid with rows representing each of the different effectiveness ratings (“Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” and “Ineffective”) and the columns representing teachers in their first, second, or third year of experience. All teachers in their first three years of experience were assigned to a particular cell in this grid. Some EPIs did not have teachers with certain effectiveness ratings; these EPIs had the corresponding row(s) left blank. Some EPIs did not have teachers in their second or third year of experience; these EPIs had the corresponding column(s) left blank.

MDE then computed the percent of teachers in each effectiveness category within a particular EPI and within a particular year of experience. For example, consider an EPI with 10 teachers in their first year of experience, three of whom were Highly Effective, five Effective, one Minimally Effective, and one Ineffective. Regardless of the number of teachers from this EPI in their second or third year of experience, its first-year percentages would be 30 percent Highly Effective, 50 percent Effective, 10 percent Minimally Effective, and 10 percent Ineffective. This process was done separately for all EPIs and for each year of experience.

Next, the MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. Highly Effective teacher ratings were assigned 1.00 points, Effective teacher ratings were assigned 0.80 points, Minimally Effective teacher ratings were assigned 0.30 points, and Ineffective teacher ratings were assigned zero points. This point scale is shown in Table 2. There are several reasons for this particular point scale. First, moving from Minimally Effective to Effective is valued more highly than moving from Ineffective to Minimally Effective. Moving teachers towards effectiveness should be rewarded, no matter whether teachers are near or far from effectiveness. However, it is important to incentivize the training of Effective teachers; while Minimally Effective teachers are preferable to Ineffective teachers, Effective teachers are greatly preferred to either.

Second, there is an even smaller difference between Effective and Highly Effective teachers. While Highly Effective teachers may have a large impact on their students, MDE’s priority is first and foremost to guarantee an effective education for all students in Michigan. This point system balances rewarding the Highly Effective rating with the need to incentivize overall effectiveness.

Finally, it should be noted that the Effective rating was not assigned a full 1.00 score because teachers, even when considered effective, can and should strive to improve their teaching practices through professional development, collaboration with other teachers (e.g., professional learning communities), reflection and refinement of their practice, extending their skills through continuing education, and a host of other options. As a result, 0.80 was selected as a fair threshold to show that while an Effective rating is certainly a positive one, there is no immediate “ceiling” that would otherwise defeat an argument toward continuous improvement. The percent of teachers in each effectiveness category is therefore multiplied by the corresponding point value.

The point values within each column are then added together to give a score for each year. In the example above, our hypothetical EPI would have a score of 73 for this year. They are awarded 30 points from having 30 percent Highly Effective teachers in their first year of experience, 40 points from having 50 percent Effective teachers, 3 points from having 10 percent Minimally Effective teachers, and 0 points from having 10 percent Ineffective teachers. Doing this for all three years produces three scores on a zero-to-100 scale.

MDE then computes a weighted sum of these three-year scores. Factors outside the control of an EPI may account for differing amounts of teachers’ performance over time; an unweighted average would give these factors too much influence over this component score. As teachers in their first year may face a steep learning

component score calculation

EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS LABELS POINT ATTRIBUTION (continued)

curve, performance in this year receives a slightly lower weight of 0.3. Teachers in their third year of experience may have learned significantly from their experience rather than from their EPI, so performance in this year receives a still lower weight of 0.2. Performance in the second year of experience receives the remaining 0.5. In cases where an EPI has no teachers in a particular year of experience, these weights were scaled proportionately to add up to 1 (one). Information on each of these possible scenarios is contained in Table 3.

Weighting each year's score by the corresponding value and adding the three years together will therefore produce a single educator effectiveness point score, abbreviated EFF on the 2015 EPI Performance Score Component and Overall Score Reports.

When the MDE assigned labels that were earned by teachers prepared at Michigan EPIs, it used a set of business rules for inclusion or exclusion of those label records along a set of 8 codes. These codes were explained to EPIs during an appeals process during which EPIs reviewed their preliminary effectiveness label reports. Table 1 below lists those business rules, which were applied to one or more REP collection periods.

Table 1: INCLUSION/EXCLUSION CODES FOR EFFECTIVENESS LABEL REPORTS

ID	Action	Description of Code
0	Record retained	Comment made by EPI was noted but no change of record is necessary.
1	Record retained	Comment made by EPI was noted but no change of record is necessary.
2	Record retained	Issue with PIC number associated with teacher; this data quality process was completed before scoring calculation was done.
3	Record retained	Employment record was updated in REP, causing the record to be originally excluded for that REP collection period.
4	Record retained	Teacher was not reported with an effectiveness label for that REP collection period.
5	Record retained	Educator was employed in multiple districts, which did not affect the attribution of a label to an EPI.
6	Record retained	Educator was found to have an assignment that did not match the original endorsement, but this did not affect the attribution of a label to an EPI.
7	Record retained	Educator was assigned as the facilitator of online instruction, which was determined to be a valid placement for the certificate/endorsement.
8	Record retained	Educator's only certificate was issued by appealing EPI, and thus there was no other EPI to whom to attribute the label.

In addition, the business rule was also observed that if more than one EPI contributed to the preparation of the teacher, the EPI who recommended the teacher for his or her initial provisional certification would be attributed the effectiveness label, upon confirmation that the EPI was approved for that preparation program.

component score calculation

EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS LABELS POINT ATTRIBUTION (continued)

Table 2: FTE AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Full-Time Equivalency (FTE)	Completed Years of Experience
0 to 0.20	0
0.21 to 1.20	1
1.21 to 2.20	2
2.21+	3+

Table 3: POINT VALUES BY EFFECTIVENESS LABEL

Effectiveness Label	Point Value
Highly Effective	1.00
Effective	0.80
Minimally Effective	0.30
Ineffective	0.00

Table 4: MISSING YEAR SCENARIOS

Scenario	Year 1 Data	Year 2 Data	Year 3 Data	Year 1 Weight	Year 2 Weight	Year 3 Weight
1	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.3000	0.5000	0.2000
2	Yes	Yes	No	0.3750	0.6250	–
3	Yes	No	Yes	0.6000	–	0.4000
4	No	Yes	Yes	–	0.7143	0.2857
5	Yes	No	No	1.0000	–	–
6	No	Yes	No	–	1.0000	–
7	No	No	Yes	–	–	1.0000

overall score calculation summary

To review thus far, the 2015 EPI Performance Score has three component sub-scores:

- the MTTC aggregate passing percentages for a three-year period,
- the combined efficacy percentages from teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys, and
- the point attributions for teacher effectiveness labels gathered from Michigan public schools during the most recent three-year period within the five years following initial certifications.

Each of these three sub-scores can be expressed as an “index” score out of 100 points possible, such as a single percentage or a total percentage including the three sub-scores.

In October of 2013, when revisions to the existing EPI Performance Score were presented, MDE leadership reviewed three underlying goals of the score. Each goal was assigned a score “weighting” relative to the goal’s significance within the overall score itself.

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

Each of the sub-scores contributes to at least one of the three goals. Accordingly, each sub-score has a percentage weight that shows its relative significance within the overall EPI score. The three component sub-scores are thus multiplied by their relative weights and by the EPI score element to contribute to an overall point total for goals 1, 2, and 3.

Table 4 (on the following page) shows the contribution of the two sub-scores (MTTC performance and surveys) included in Goal 1. Table 5 shows the same pattern, but for Goal 2. Finally, Table 6 shows the contribution of one sub-score (three-year teacher effectiveness percentage) to Goal 3. In each of the three “Goal” columns, an organizing, sequential code is shown; the “Weight” column is the relative weight of the sub-score to the goal itself (thus, within a goal the relative weights add up to 100 percent); the “Type” is the measurement tool upon which the data is based; and the description is a category marker that appears in the instrumentation itself, or a note that further explains the “Type.”

By multiplying the component “index” or percentage scores by each relative weight, a total point score for each goal is reached; this total point score is then multiplied by the overall goal weight. These three numbers are totaled, and a final overall EPI Performance Score is derived.

When reporting educator effectiveness data for calculation as a component score, some EPIs were found to have too few teachers (across the multiple educator effectiveness data collection points) to serve as an accurate representation of the quality of their training. Goal 3 is measured exclusively by the point values attributed to educator effectiveness labels.

Thus, in order to compute overall goal weight, a variable goal-weighting program was developed for four “bins” of EPIs, with each “bin” corresponding to the percentage of teachers who had completed a program and been assigned effectiveness labels over the three-year period (this data was captured from the MOECS system and annual Title II reports made to USED). The weightings are shown below on Table 7.

overall score calculation

Table 5: BREAKDOWN OF CONTRIBUTING COMPONENTS TO GOAL 1

Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification

Goal	Weight	Type	Description
1.1 (a)	70	Aggregate Pass Percentage	Aggregate Pass Percentage
<i>Combined Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Surveys (efficacy percentages averaged across seven categories)</i>			
Goal	Weight	Type	Description
1.1 (b)	30	Likert Response Values	High-Quality Learning Experiences
1.1 (c)		Likert Response Values	Critical Thinking
1.1 (d)		Likert Response Values	Connection to Real-World Problems and Issues
1.2 (a)		Likert Response Values	Use of Educational Technology
1.2 (b)		Likert Response Values	Response to Needs to Students of Special Populations
1.2 (c)		Likert Response Values	Organizing the Learning Environment
1.2 (d)		Likert Response Values	Use of Student Data

Table 6: BREAKDOWN OF CONTRIBUTING COMPONENTS TO GOAL 2

*Combined Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Surveys
(efficacy percentages from one of four categories)*

Goal	Weight	Type	Description
2.1	0	Likert Response Values	Candidate Diversity (to be included in future EPI Score)
2.2	100	Likert Response Values	Field Experience and Clinical Preparation
2.3	0	Likert Response Values	Effectiveness as Educator (captured in Goal 3)
2.4	0	Likert Response Values	Shortage Areas and Advising (to be included in future EPI Score)

Table 7: BREAKDOWN OF CONTRIBUTING COMPONENTS TO GOAL 3

Point Score Totals Attributed to Teacher Effectiveness Percentages for EPI Program Graduates, for most recent three-years of full time teaching experience within five years of initial certification

Goal	Weight	Type	Description
3.1	100	Aggregate Score Totals	Point Score Totals from Last Three Effectiveness Labels Gathered from Five-Year Window
3.2	0	Aggregate Score Totals	Placement Rates (to be included in future EPI Score)

overall score calculation summary

Table 8: VARYING PERCENTAGE WEIGHTS FOR OVERALL SCORE CALCULATION

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

conclusion

Following the recommendations of the January 2015 expert panel, a cut score of 84.5 was set on the scale for the overall performance score, reflecting the minimum overall score an EPI needed to be considered satisfactory. MDE leadership set this cut score from looking at a consensus of our panel judges (see Appendix A for more information).

In order to assign the resultant performance category, the cut score of 84.5 is now used as the first decision in determining how an EPI progresses along the “track” of categories and resultant corrective actions. A diagram for the progressive corrective action system is included as Appendix C; also please refer to the MDE OPPS Web site at www.michigan.gov/teachercert for more information.

It is important to note that whether or not an EPI has met the cut score for adequate performance each year will lead to an EPI being assigned a new “phase,” or step, in the corrective action system. This phase will then, in turn, determine their reported performance category and thus the corrective action requirements expected for the next year. Institutions who earn an overall score

equal to or higher than the cut score will improve by one phase increment, lowering their phase number toward zero (improving their performance category status).

Conversely, EPIs who fail to meet the cut score will have their phase number raised by one phase increment toward six (worsening their performance category status). A phase number of 0 or 1 results in a reported category of Satisfactory; a phase number of 2 or 3 results in a reported category of At Risk; and a phase number of 4 through 6 results in a reported category of Low Performing.

The final list of institutions being assigned to each performance category is expected to be published in May 2015 in a memo from the MDE, which will include general information about the component and overall scores. In addition, following changes instituted starting in 2014, EPIs will now receive specialized reports detailing their component and overall scores, how overall scores were calculated, and what performance category they have been assigned for 2015-2016.

